DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 022 HE 003 102

AUTHOR	Calabrese, Maureen
TITLE	The Academic Women. Case Study: IWU.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Weslayan Univ., Bloomington.
PUB DATE	28 Jan 72
NOTE	30p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Feminism; *Higher Education; *Sex Discrimination; Womens Education; *Women Teachers

ABSTRACT

Women in all phases of professional life have been discriminated against in the past and this tradition is being carried over to the present. This paper reviews the problems of academic women in the society at large and particularly at Illinois Wesleyan University. Items included in the study are tenure and status of the women at IWU; the percentage of women on committees at IWU; and salary differences in men and women at IWU. Findings show that: (1) 42% of the women faculty members are tenured as compared with 55% of the men; (2) in a 5-year period from the academic years 1966 through 1970, only 2 committees were chaired by women and the percentage of women on committees ranged from 17% to 30%; and (3) the mean salary for all women faculty is $9,911 as compared with the mean salary for men, which is $12,094. (HS)

ED 065022

The Academic Women

Case Study: IWU (Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, 61701)

A Report to the Personnel Council from
the Sociology of Women Seminar

by

Maureen Calabrese
January 28, 1972

HE003102

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Preface

Women's place in society as mother and wife has been so widely accepted as innate and right that to question it is blasphemy. But question it we must! The basic relationship of man and woman in our society is that of oppressor and oppressed. Recognition of this fact allows each of us to break the cultural chains that bind us to our sex-determined roles. In each man there is a gentleness and compassion, so called feminine traits; and in each woman there is ambition and drive. We must learn to recognize each person as a human being first; then as a man or woman. Simone de Beauvoir commented on this problem of a masculine woman in this way: "Man is defined as a human being and woman is defined as a female. Whenever a woman tries to behave like a human being, she is accused of trying to behave like a man."

Only the economic aspect of this complex issue is presented in this paper. Particular attention is given to the problems of academic women in the society at large and here at Illinois Wesleyan University. This report is not comprehensive, nor was it intended to be. Rather, I hope it serves as a springboard for further research into the issue.

Secondary Research

It is no longer thought that education will injure the female's delicate child-bearing apparatus, nor that forcing our smaller brains in puberty will use up the blood needed for menstruation leading to anemia and morbidity. Yet the sad fact is that in 1972 women are still not afforded equal status with men in the world of the university, neither in academic employment, nor in educational opportunity, nor in the business world.[1]

A woman encounters discrimination immediately when she tries to enter business. A recent survey of college placement directors reveals that women are being offered fewer jobs, less responsible jobs and lower salaries than men with comparable qualifications. Another survey shows that of two hundred and eight companies recruiting at Northwestern University, only 63% are considering female grads. Some firms are beginning to interview more women since the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but their hiring practices have not changed. They give mere "lip service" to the law by interviewing women, but then hire men.[2]

Even when firms do interview them, women find that the recruitment literature is often discriminatory. Some brochures still distinguish between jobs for men and women. Others are more subtle by picturing "young men on the move" -- but no women other than secretaries, receptionists, and general office workers. And even those brochures specifically designed to attract women are pitched way below the aspiration level of career-minded women. Placement directors indicate that those booklets often recruit women for 'special' programs. These programs usually involve a less responsible or second-class position and a lower salary than a man.

These findings are consistent with government figures which indicate that even a higher degree of education and training doesn't necessarily

bring the average woman a salary comparable to a man's. In 1968, for example, a woman with four years of college was typically earning $6,694 a year, while a man with an eighth grade education averaged $6,580 -- just a fraction less. The typical male graduate, meanwhile, earned $11,795.[4]

Women in this country no longer work as a diversion, if they ever did. Labor Department studies show that 85% work because they have to, and that the typical worker is forty-one and married. Nonetheless, women earn under 60% of what men do. This is partly caused by the segregation of women into low-status, low-paying jobs. A 1968 study by the U.S. Equal Employment Commission revealed that in a hundred major New York corporations women held only 3.8% of the management posts, and 4.7% of the professional jobs. Almost 70% of the City's women workers are in clerical jobs. Even more infuriating is the fact that men get higher pay than women in identical work.[5]

The working mother faces a doubly difficult situation, because not only is she forced into accepting a low-paying job but she must also provide for supervision and care for her children. Almost 40% of the women who work are mothers, and 40% of these have children under six. In fact, over a quarter of all mothers with children under six work. Yet, nationally only 2% of the children of working mothers receive group day care. In New York City, over 150,000 children under five have working mothers, yet the City's day care centers have space for only eight thousand children from three to five years.[6]

The problem is reaching crisis proportions. The private day care centers are inadequate and expensive. Day care centers for these children is the basic assistance that working mothers require in order to earn their living. The extra burden of taking on child care expenses can often prevent a woman from working, or even be enough to place the family below the poverty line. It isn't surprising that one fourth of all families headed by white women

are on poverty or that half of those headed by black women are also.[7] It is amazing that working mothers are not allowed to deduct child care expenses, while tax laws recognize the generous deductions for entertainment and the "businessman's" lunch. The law is being changed in order to produce a more equitable situation.

The parallel between the status of women and the Blacks is quite striking. Many of the same generalizations and attitudes are connected to both groups. Both groups are a labor reserve, denied equal hiring, learning, pay, promotion, responsibility, and seniority at work. Yet the discrimination against women is especially difficult to combat because, as Ann Scott said, it is a cultural iceberg. 9/10 of it is hidden. The covert discrimination is submerged in a largely unquestioned tradition of women as inferiors. This covert discrimination reveals itself most strikingly in such places as statistics on employment and education, archaic laws, stereotypes of folk lore (shrewish wife or dumb blonde jokes) or a propensity to treat the genuine anger of women as a source of cheap humor about lesbians or sexual starvation.[8]

It is this covert discrimination which is our culture's oldest, most subtle, most widespread, and thereby, most widely destructive antagonism. Its cost to women in terms of damaged self-esteem, wasted potential, and suppressed rage is impossible to compute. It is also this discrimination that the Universities engage in and perpetuate. While the universities have made progress in helping other minority groups, they have largely ignored the problem of women. In fact, the proportion of women teaching in the universities has declined since the 1940's. This is in spite of the fact that the proportion of women going to college has been increasing.

These patterns of overt and covert discrimination in higher education reflects the attitudes and prejudices of society at large. However, this

doesn't exonerate the universities from its share of the guilt for allowing it to exist. In fact, because the universities should lead the way in combating ignorance and bigotry, they are doubly at fault if they do not set an example of equality for the rest of society to imitate. The Universities must re-examine their policies toward women and become increasingly more sensitive to the instances of both covert and overt discrimination.

Discrimination continuously recreates its own justification. Women are discouraged from and passed over for graduate programs and faculty appointments because of the belief that they will quit, start a family, or follow their husband if he is transferred. These charges are, of course, sometimes true. More women than men do drop out of faculty and graduate programs leading to lowered expectation of women's success, leading to more women dropping out -- as they are expected to. Rank reveals an inverse spiral: the higher the academic stratum, the lower the overall percentage of women, until at the top women simply disappear. Since women have a visibly lower chance of success than men, fewer women are inspired to try, lowering in turn the numbers of women available.

Part of the problem is that there are no "visible life models" or "role models" as sociologist refer to them for female college students to pattern their life style on. The only role models presented to the female student are those of wife and mother or sex playmate. Without any visible chance for their sex, many qualified and talented women accept the roles society has relegated to them. The situation is further complicated by the fact that women, like all minorities, internalize the culture's attitudes.[9]

A recent study by Matina Horner shows that not only are women conditioned not to compete, but, more important, not to succeed. His work indicates, in fact, a distant correlation: the more a woman wants to succeed, the more

likely she is to fail through anxiety that success can be bought only at the price of social ostracism and loss of femininity -- of becoming that social monster, the aggressive woman. And the greater the chance of success, the greater the penalties. Therefore, given equal or even lesser abilities, a man has a better chance of success because he knows that society will reward him, whereas a woman feels it will punish her.[10]

The status of women on the campus is merely a carbon copy of the general employment patterns in the United States. In the language of the OFCC, women in the University are "underutilized" or less "adequately represented" in certain job categories than would be "expected by their availability."

In the graduate school of the State University of New York at Buffalo, the percentage of women graduate students in each department is higher than the percentage of women faculty. This suggests that overwhelmingly male faculties are earning their livings out of what has been referred to as the "pimping system;" that is, by training women in professions into which they are unwilling to hire women as colleagues and equals. A situation like the History Department, for example, where 24% of the graduate students are women, but no woman is on the faculty, strongly indicates "underutilization" -- women, professionally trained, are "available" in the work pool, but are not being hired.[11]

Much of the covert discrimination against women is revealed through the jokes and comments men make to and about women. This is particularly noticeable at the graduate level of the universities where a woman's dedication is constantly being questioned despite her work or qualifications. One such comment reveals many of the faculty's attitude: "I know you're competent and your thesis advisor knows you're competent. The question in our minds

is are you <u>really</u> <u>serious</u> about what you're doing?" Or "Why don't you find a rich husband and give this all up?"

To a young widow with a 5-year-old child who needed a fellowship to continue graduate school: "You're very attractive. You'll get married again. We have to give fellowships to people who really need them."[12]

Comments such as these can hardly be taken as encouragement for women students to develop an image of themselves as scholars. Female graduate students are being constantly told in a thousand ways that the professors have different expectations about their performance than the performance of male students -- expectations based not on their ability but on the simple fact that they are women. Even in the realm of higher education women are regarded as sex objects. Subtly they are told that their only purpose is to be decorative objects in the classroom and that they are unlikely to finish their Ph. D., and if they do, there must be something "wrong" with them. Their place is in the home in the role of wife-mother.

Expectations have a great effect on performance. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) have shown that when teachers expected randomly selected students to "bloom" during the year, those students' IQs increased significantly above those of the control group. They had also shown that experimenter expectation made significant differences in the performance of the subjects. This phenomenon most likely also affects graduate students. When professors expect less of certain students, those students are likely to respond by producing less.[13]

There is a slightly higher attrition rate for women than male graduate students. At the University of Chicago the difference is only 5%, a figure that is statistically insignificant. Accurate statistics on a national basis are not available. This difference in the attrition rate is probably largely

caused by the treatment the female graduate student receives from the administration, faculty and other students throughout their training. Their commitment to their work is being constantly questioned. Women are repeatedly asked if they are "serious." This constant barrage of doubts and questions can discourage the most able of women. They begin to question themselves and the joy that is gained from being successful in a field is stolen from them. Even after a woman completes her Ph. D. after many years of dedicated work, a prospective employer will still ask "if she is really serious about entering the man's world." The study completed by the Women's Committee at the University of Chicago concludes that women receive significantly less perceived support for career plans than men do, and that a large number of women had met with or had heard of discriminatory experiences with respect to women. Moreover, the women students felt that men students were often preferred by the faculty.[14]

Placed under these types of pressures it is no wonder that many women simply give in to the demands of society that she stifle her creativity and comply with the mother-wife role. Increasing the pressures to quit is the fact that women graduate students are discriminated against when graduate fellowships are awarded. There are no exact statistics on this due to the fact that administrations consistently refuse to release the data on the numbers of men and women who apply for fellowship awards. This is a left-handed proof of discrimination because if there was none, the statistics would have been released. This form of discrimination can force many women into dropping out because of lack of funds. When the conditions that the female graduate student is placed in are examined it is surprising that there isn't an even higher attrition rate than there is.

The fears about the dedication of women students can not hold up in

the light of the facts. In a study on the woman Ph. D., it was found that a very high proportion of women with doctorates "practice their trade." About half of the women in the sample were married. Practically all of the unmarried women, 96%, and 87% of the married women without children work full time. Even among married women with children, 60% work full time and 25% work part time.[15]

The University of Chicago's report on women challenges the commonly held notion that women are less committed as students than men. When asked what they expected to be doing ten years from now 91% of the women students expected to be involved in a career as compared with 94% of the men. Any 5 to 6% of the women indicated they would like or expected to be occupied with family alone ten years from now. Women and men appear to feel equally favorable about going to or being in graduate school. Furthermore, 62% of the women and 53% of the men said they would be "very disappointed" if they left school before completing their education.[16]

It is tragic that any human being is denied the opportunity to exercise and fulfill their talents and ability because of prejudice and fear. But it is an even greater tragedy when you realize that it is the people in the very top of their field, those who show the most promise, that are stifled. In order to even gain admission to a graduate school a woman must demonstrate above average ability and grades. In reports at both Columbia University and the University of Chicago, there is conclusive evidence that the grade average of women must be significantly higher than that of men for the women to gain admission to graduate school. Chicago's results show that 9.1% of women reported straight A averages compared with 6.8% of the men; 24.9% of the women reported A- averages compared with 20.1% of the men; and 32.2% of the women had B+ averages compared with 31.6% of the men. Only 30% of the women compared with 41% of the men had grade averages of B or lower. These figures

support the commonly recognized fact that while men can secure a place in graduate school with a B average a woman needs an A.[17]

The quota system has been and still is in effect in many male-dominated fields. This restricts the number of spots open for women and other minority groups. A quota system is almost certainly in effect in any graduate program or profession that regularly admits only a small and uniform percentage of women students. One example of this is Columbia's College of Physicians and Surgeons with its regular 10%. In another instance, a woman discovered that the School of Architecture operated a quota, alloting some 10-15% of its places to women. Now that students are on the admissions committee and the female quota has been dropped, the School of Architecture has admitted more women than men students, an astonishing reversal of numbers.

Under this system of educational roulette it is not surprising that only one of every three hundred women in the United States who have the potential to earn a Ph. D. degree actually obtain it. One in thirty is the corresponding figure for men.[18]

Male-dominated fields show the most resistance to accepting women on an equal basis. Women applicants to medical schools have increased over 300% in thirty-six years, while male applicants have increased only 29%. But the proportion of women accepted over this time has fallen, and the percent of men accepted has risen. These figures indicate that the persistence of limited admission of women to medical schools stems from discriminatory medical school admission policies.[19]

In a study conducted at six colleges in Pennsylvania in 1968, discriminatory employment attitudes toward academic women was tested as well as a general belief that women are subordinate. The major outcome of the study was the demonstration that discriminatory attitudes toward academic women

were exhibited by the sampled employing agents when considering equally qualified male and female candidates. When all variables were equal except for sex, the male candidate was typically chosen for employment.

On the other hand, employing agents selected for employment a statistically significant number of superior females in preference to less qualified males. This finding is consistent with previous research which suggested that hiring officials tend to employ highly qualified females if qualified males are not available.

It was determined that the high female employment fields (English, French, Spanish, Art) group selected significantly more equally qualified females than did the low female employment fields (History, Philosophy, Political Science) group. This was also true for the superior females.

Women are not selected on an equal basis with males. Academic women must be more highly qualified than their male competitors for higher education positions. Further, even highly qualified women are less likely to find positions in the academic fields that employ few females.[20]

Women earned about 13% of all the Ph.D.'s awarded in the 1960's, 40% of master's and comprised about 22% of the faculty in all institutions of higher education. However, women are distributed unevenly, clustered in the lower ranks, in part-time positions, and in schools considered to be low-prestige such as junior colleges, educational schools, and undergraduate rather than graduate level. As an example, 22% of all those who teach English in four year institutions are women, but the comparable figure for two year junior and community colleges is twice that at 44%.[21] Also, women are more likely to act as, and be cast in the role of, teachers rather than professors. The crucial difference being that a teacher is one who passes on an intellectual heritage and a professor is one who helps create the heritage.[22]

Men may, and are, encouraged to teach at women's schools. But it is nearly impossible to find women in full-time teaching positions in men's undergraduate colleges. Only Wellesley, in fact, of the Seven Sisters colleges has more female than male faculty in tenured ranks and in chairmanships. In the rest, male faculty dominate the upper levels and in some cases the lower positions as well. At Vassar women have dropped from 55.6% of the faculty in 1958-9 to 40.5% in 1969-70. The number of women with full professorships has dropped during the same period from 35 to 16. At Vassar it was thought that a co-educational faculty provided a healthier atmosphere for women students. The reverse doesn't seem to apply to Harvard, Princeton, Yale or Brown. Harvard has no full or associate professors who are women, and even at assistant professor levels it can muster only a paltry 4.6%. The consistent exclusion of women from positions on the faculties of the Seven Brothers schools is probably the most blatant example of sexual discrimination to be found in academe. Women learn to confine their job applications to co-educational institutions and to women's schools. Men may work anywhere, on the other hand, and can even expect preferential treatment at the best women's colleges.[23]

The lower median salaries of women in academe than of men is partly explained by their exclusion from the better paying jobs and higher ranks, but even with these factors equal, women still earn less than men with comparable qualifications. Coupled with the fact that men are promoted faster than women, the differences become even greater.

This view is confirmed by the Earning Gap Report which stated that men and women college professors at the same academic rank are accorded unequal pay. In institutions in 1965-66 women full professors had a median salary of only $11,694 as compared with $12,768 for men. A comparison of the median wage and salary incomes of women and men who work full time year round re-

veals not only that those of women are considerably less than men's but also that the gap has widened in recent years. In 1955, for example, a woman's median salary income was $2,719 and was 64% of the $4,252 received by men. In 1968, women's median earnings of $4,457 were only 58% of the $11,664 received by men.[24]

END NOTES

[1]Ann Scott, "The Half-Eaten Apple: A Look at Sex Discrimination in the University," Reporter, May 14, 1970, reprinted in Hearings on Section 805 of H. R. 1608 Before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, 91st Congress, 2nd Session 1060 (1970), 212. (hereinafter cited as 1970 Hearings.)

[2]"Special Report: Why Doesn't Business Hire More College-Trained Women?", Personnel Management -- Policies and Practices, April 1969, reprinted in 1970 Hearings, 174.

[3]Ibid., 175.

[4]"Rebelling Women -- The Reason," U.S. News and World Report, April 13, 1970, reprinted in 1970 Hearings, 22.

[5]"Platform on Women's Rights, New Democratic Coalition, New York State, Adopted March 10, 1970," reprinted 1970 Hearings, 177.

[6]Ibid., 198.

[7]Pauli Murray, "Economic and Educational Inequality on Sex: An Overview," Valparaiso University Law Review, 238.

[8]Scott, 213.

[9]Ibid., 214.

[10]Matina Horner, "Fail: Bright Women," Psychology Today, November 1969, in 1970 Hearings, 896.

[11]Scott, 219.

[12]Statement of Ann Sutherland Harris, Assistant Professor Art History, Columbia University, reprinted in 1970 Hearings, 242.

[13]Ibid., 244.

[14]"Women in the University of Chicago," Committee on University Women, May 1, 1970.

[15]Rita James Simon, Shirly Merritt Clark, Kathleen Galway, "The Woman Ph.D.: A Recent People," Social Problems, Fall 1967 (vol. 15, no. 2).

[16]Women in University of Chicago, 43.

[17]Harris, 250.

[18]Harry G. Shaffer, Juliet P. S. Shaffer, "Job Discrimination Against Faculty Wives." Journal of Higher Education, January 1966 (vol. 37, no. 1).

[19]Statement by Dr. Francis S. Norris, Washington, D. C. Reprinted 1970 Hearings, p. 520.

[20]Lawrence A. Simpson, "A Myth is Better than a Miss: Men Get the Edge in Academic Employment." College and University Business, February 1970 (vol. 48, no. 2).

[21]"A Report From the Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession," reprinted 1970 Hearings, 170.

[22]Simon

[23]Harris, 254.

[24]"Statement of Mrs. Myra Ruth Harman," reprinted in 1970 Hearings, 12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Murray, Pauli. "Economic and Educational Inequality Based on Sex: An Overview," Valparaiso University Law Review (1971).

Shaffer, Harry G., Shaffer, Juliet. "Job Discrimination Against Faculty Wives." Journal of Higher Education. January 1966 (vol. 37, no. 1).

Simpson, Lawrence. "A Myth is Better than a Miss: Men Get the Edge in Academic Employment." College and University Business. February 1970 (vol. 48, no. 2)

. . . "Women in the University of Chicago." Committee on University Women. May 1, 1970. (Chicago 1970).

. . . "The Status of Women Faculty at Illinois State University." The Research Committee, Women Faculty Association. 1971.

Hearings on Section 805 of H. R. 1608 Before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, 1060 (1970).

PRIMARY RESEARCH

CASE STUDY: WOMEN FACULTY AT ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Before the status of the academic woman can be changed each university must examine itself in the face of the problem. This case study is an attempt to look at Wesleyan's campus objectively in order to discover what course of action should be taken.

The statistics concerning such items as number, rank, and tenure were compiled from sources readily available. The teaching staff list for 1971-72 and the records of committee memberships were obtained from the administration. The university bulletin was used as the source for information concerning educational qualifications and the length of service at Wesleyan. All information concerning salary was obtained through the distribution of a confidential survey.

The number of the total faculty at IWU is 141. Women number 49 or 35% of the faculty. This is a higher proportion than is found at 'elite' universities such as the University of Chicago, or in universities nationally. Chicago has a women faculty of 7% while at schools traditionally teachers' colleges such as ISU the figure is 31%.

Yet this rosy picture can be deceiving for while the total university's proportion is 35%, there is a wide disparity in the number of women in the various schools of the university. The most dramatic example of this is the contrast of the Nursing School which has a totally female staff with the business and economics courses which have no women faculty. As a whole the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Fine Arts both have the same percentage of women (26%). Yet in the Fine Arts, women are concentrated mainly in the School of Music where they make up 31% of the faculty. The School of Art has no women faculty while the Drama School has only one woman.

The bright spot in the Liberal Arts is the Foreign Language Department which actually has six women or 55% of the staff. On the other hand, there are eight departments with no women faculty. These departments are Business Administration, Economics, Finances and Insurance, Religion, Physics, Psychology, History and Political Science. Six departments have only one woman faculty member and only three departments have female heads and one of these is the traditional woman's field of Home Economics. The other two departments are Mathematics and Speech. (Table 1)

A disproportionate number of women, 18%, are employed part time when compared to the male rate of only 5%. This rate seems unfairly high when the small total percentage of women faculty is taken into consideration. Women make up 64% of the total part time staff. In the case of the foreign language department, two of the six women are part time although none of the five male faculty members are.

Thirty-eight percent of the women hold the rank of instructor or below while only fifteen percent of the men are in these ranks. In the top three ranks the percent of male faculty is consistantly higher than female faculty. Seventeen percent of the men have rank of professor while only ten percent of the women do. Likewise, 21% of the men and 16% of the women are associate professors; and 43% of the men and 35% of the women are assistant professors. (Table 2)

As far as professional degrees are concerned, the men hold the advantage. Forty-five percent of the male faculty have their doctorate while only 17% of the women do. Although 63% of the women have their masters, 20% have only a bachelor degree. The men's rates are 52% and 3% respectively. For the total university, 36% of the faculty have doctorates and 56% have masters. (Table 3)

Most of the faculty is fairly new to the campus. Fifty-four percent of the women and 46% of the men have been at IWU five years or less. Twenty-one percent of the women and 33% of the men have been on the staff for six to ten years. The early 1950's saw about 18% of the women and 6% of the men come to campus. (Table 4)

The large number of women new to the campus would seem to indicate a breakdown of the barriers to the hiring of women. Unfortunately, the majority of the new women were hired for positions in traditionally female departments. Forty-eight percent of the new women were recruited for the Nursing School, 19% for the foreign language department, and 10% each for English and women's physical education. (Table 5)

TENURE

About 50% of the faculty or 72 faculty members are on tenure. Twenty-nine percent of these, or 21 are women. Forty-two percent of the women faculty members are tenured while 55% of the men are tenured. The difference may be caused by the fact that so many of the women are new to the campus or by the fact that women are in the lower ranks.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

In order to study the pattern of committee memberships, the records for the committees from 1966-67, excluding 1967-68, were used. The change in the Faculty Constitution affected the structure of several important committees, so that they are not continuous throughout the period. These committees are so significant that instead of eliminating them, I have tried to balance them with a committee that had a corresponding duty. The other

committees were chosen for study either because of their continuous nature or because of their importance to campus life. However, the breakdown of each committee is not so important as the total pattern that emerges. Both faculty and administration were included in the figure but the students are not.

The highest percentage of women on the committees occurred in 1967 and was 30%. In 1968, it was 26%; in 1969 it was 17%; and in 1970 it rose to 20% where it has held for this year. Only twice during this whole five year period was a committee chaired by a woman. In 1968 and 1966, Student Personnel Council was headed by a woman. (Table 6). However, this was an automatic administrative duty because of her job.

SALARY

The information of faculty age and salary were obtained through the use of a survey of the faculty. Thirty-seven percent of the faculty responded to the survey. Of the women 45% completed the survey while 34% of the men did.

The women completing the survey tended to be younger than the men, while 35% of the male respondents were in the 40-50 group, only 18% of the women were in that group. Sixty-four percent of the women were under forty years old, but only 52% of men were. But in the youngest age group (25-30) there were 26% of the men represented as compared to 23% of the women. (Table 7)

In analyzing the salaries of the faculty who responded to the survey, the variables of qualifications or experience were not taken into account. The mean salary for all the women faculty regardless of rank is $9,911; the comparable figure for men is $12,094. This is a difference of $2,183, which

over a period of years could accumulate into quite a tidy sum.

Of the male professors 56% responded and their mean salary is $14,283 which is slightly higher than that of the single response from the female professors. Fifty percent of the female associate professors and 26% of the male associate professors returned the surveys. The mean salary for the women is $11,487 while the mean salary for the men is $12,970; nearly $1,500 greater.

Fifty-eight percent of the women and 30% of the men assistant professors answered the survey. The women's mean salary is $10,100 while the men's is $11,102 which is a thousand dollars greater. Fifty percent of both the women and men instructors responded. It is at this level that the difference between the men's and women's mean salary becomes less than two hundred dollars. The men's mean salary is $9,300 while the women's is $9,131.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The status of women in the Wesleyan community is bound to the position of women in the society as a whole, and that position is in a state of turmoil. It is in the present state of uncertainty and confusion in society at large over the role of women that the university should take a lead. It is the duty of the university to recognize its failings and to take affirmative action.

The total number of women faculty is only 35% while the female student enrollment is well over half. A significant number of departments have no or very few women faculty. Women are concentrated in the so called "woman's" fields such as nursing, home economics, languages, and to some extent English. The university should actively recruit women for the positions in the male dominated fields. The university should reexamine the hiring practices of each of the departments to insure that women are being given equal consideration.

The university counseling service should encourage women undergraduates to venture into so far "forbidden" fields. No recruiter should be allowed on campus that discriminates against women, either by refusing to interview women or by interviewing women only for secretarial or second class work.

The problems of lower rank for women, the higher percentage of women working part time, and salary are all affected in some way by the women faculty's comparative failure to obtain professional recognition through a doctorate. The difficulties encountered by the female graduate student are extremely complex. The university must encourage its women faculty to continue or resume their studies by providing them with ready access to sabbatical or graduate study leaves.

The pattern of committee memberships reveals a drastic underutilization of the women faculty members. Only in one year did the percentage of women on committees ever come near to their proportion of the faculty. The university is wasting a large part of the human resources available to them by ignoring the female faculty members. It is vital that women be on the visible and influencial committees, such as Judiciary Committee. It is the right of the undergraduate women to be able to identify with women who play an important and significant role in the university community. By limiting the female faculty's role on these committees, as well as in other positions of prestige and power, the University is denying the undergraduate woman a viable model after which to pattern herself.

The salary differences revealed by this survey are significant and discriminatory. The very low mean salary for women reflects the lower rank that many hold. But it is within the ranks themselves that the most blatant and harmful discrimination seems to be taking place. This situation must be changed in order to satisfy the needs of women as full human beings. The results of this survey are not, however, conclusive because of the low response rate from both men and women. It is vital that a complete study be made that has the University records at its command. This complete examination of the problem could be conducted by either an outside group, such as H.E.W., or by a group of individuals interested in seeing Wesleyan live up to its promises.

TABLE 1: FACULTY BY COLLEGE AND SEX

		Male	Female	%
College of Liberal Arts		65	23	26
Business And Economics Courses				
Business Administration		2*	0	0
Economics		3*	0	0
Finance and Insurance		2*	0	0
	Total	7	0	0
Humanities Courses				
English		8*	3	27
Foreign Languages		5*	6	55
Philosophy		3*	1	25
Religion		5*	0	0
	Total	21	10	32
Natural Sciences Courses				
Biology		4*	1	25
Chemistry		4*	1	25
Home Economics		0	3*	100
Mathematics		3	2*	40
Physics		3*	0	0
Psychology		3*	0	0
	Total	17	7	29
Social Sciences				
Education		3*	1	25
History		4*	0	0
Physical Education		4*	3	43
Political Science		3*	0	0
Sociology and Anthropology		3*	1	25
Speech		2	1*	33
	Total	19	6	24
College of Fine Arts				
School of Art		4*	0	0
School of Drama		4*	1	20
School of Music		18*	8	31
	Total	26	9	26
Brokaw Collegiate School of Nursing		0	17	100
	Grand Total	92	49	35

*indicates department head

TABLE 2: FACULTY BY RANK AND SEX

Rank	Men	%	Women	%	Total
Professor	16	17	5	10	21
Associate Professor	19	21	8	16	27
Assistant Professor	43	47	17	35	60
Instructor	8	9	8	16	16
Assistant Instructor	0	0	1	2	1
Specialist	5	5	9	18	14
Graduate Assistant	1	1	1	2	2
	92		49		141

TABLE 3: EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Degree	Men	%	Women	%	Total
Bachelor	3	3	9	20	12
Masters	46	52	29	63	75
Doctor	40	45	8	17	48

TABLE 4: FACULTY BY YEARS AT IWU AND SEX

Years	Men	%	Women	%	Total
0- 2	16	19	13	33	29
3- 5	23	27	8	21	31
6-10	28	33	8	21	36
11-15	8	9	2	5	10
16-20	5	6	7	18	12
21-25	1	1	1	3	2
25-30	4	5	0	0	4
31+	1	1	0	0	1
	86	100	39	100	125

0- 2	16	55	13	45	29	100%
3- 5	23	74	8	26	31	100%
6-10	28	78	8	22	36	100%
11-15	8	80	2	20	10	100%
16-20	5	42	7	58	12	100%
21-25	1	50	1	50	2	100%
25+	5	100	0	0	5	100%

Table does not include part time faculty

TABLE 5: NUMBER OF WOMEN HIRED IN LAST FIVE YEARS BY DEPARTMENT

Department	Total	%
Nursing	10	48
Foreign Languages	4	19
Women's Physical Ed.	2	10
English	2	10
Music	1	5
Math	1	5
Drama	1	5
Total	21	100

TABLE 6: COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

Committee	1971-72		1970-71		1969-70		1968-69		1966-67	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Faculty Advisory	5*	0	5*	0	------		------		------	
Liaison Committee	------		------		9*	0	6*	3	6*	3
Personnel Council	9*	1	9*	1	------		------		------	
Curriculum Council	8*	2	8*	2	------		------		------	
Dean's Council	------		------		10*	1	10	1	8	2
Judiciary Committee	6*	0	6*	0	6*	0	5*	2	4*	3
Library Committee	7*	1	8*	1	8*	1	8*	2	6*	3
Teacher Education	11*	4	11*	5	11*	6	11*	7	12*	7
Computor Policy	5*	2	6*	2	8*	1	7*	1	------	
Aesthetics	5*	3	6*	1	6*	1	------		------	
Admissions Committee	6*	2	7*	1	7*	1	6*	2	6*	2
Student Personnel	4*	3	4*	3	6*	2	6	2*	7	3*
Religious Life	7*	0	5*	2	6*	2	5*	3	5*	1
Athletic Relations	3*	1	3*	1	3*	1	3*	1	5*	1
Total	76	19	78	19	80	16	67	24	59	25
	80%	20%	80%	20%	83%	17%	74%	26%	70%	30%

*indicates the chair

Totals include administration and faculty but not students.

TABLE 7: FACULTY BY AGE AND SEX

Age	Men	%	Women	%
25-30	8	26	5	23
30-40	8	26	9	41
40-50	11	35	4	18
50-60	3	10	4	18
60-65	1	3	0	0
	31		22	

TABLE 8: FACULTY'S MEAN SALARY BY RANK

Rank	% Return M	% Return W	Men	Women
Overall Mean			$12,094.	$ 9,911.
Professor	56	20	$14,283.	-----
Associate Professor	26	50	$12,970.	$11,487.
Assistant Professor	30	58	$11,102.	$10,100.
Instructors	50	50	$ 9,300.	$ 9,131.

*Salary not reported n equals 1.